

DISCONTENT

"MOTHER OF PROGRESS"

Entered at the Postoffice at Home, Wash., as Second Class Matter.

VOL. IV. NO. 4.

HOME, WASH., WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1901.

WHOLE NO. 160.

ANARCHIST METHODS.

The outcry against the Anarchist theory falls flat to the ground, in the presence of a simple and straightforward definition of the real intent of philosophical Anarchism. The Century Dictionary defines the term with sufficient accuracy to bear repetition, as

"A social theory which regards the union of order with the absence of all direct government of man by man as the political ideal; absolute individual liberty."

Nobody can find crime or incitement to disorder in the enunciation of such an ideal. It is simply a sociological speculation, and is held by some men and women of keen intellect and fine character. It has the same standing in court as the kindred theories of autocracy, oligarchy, monarchy, democracy and Socialism. Each of these doctrines must be judged by its intrinsic merits or demerits, as tested by logic and by experience. The general common sense may safely be trusted to decide wisely in the long run, if afforded full opportunity for investigation and for experiment. The violent persecution of any one of these theories cannot eradicate it from the minds of men, but may greatly delay a fair and impartial judgment. Anarchism demands no special favors, but only asks the same fair play which is accorded to the others. Let it be heard, and then accepted or rejected on its merits. As for its advocates, they have as much claim to respect and to decent treatment as any other theorists, even if their belief is held to be untenable. It is no more a crime to disbelieve in government than to believe in it; and only the rankest tyranny could seek to stifle any man's expression of his honest convictions.

To all the above, the advocate of proscription has one, and only one plausible answer. He cannot, unless grossly and inexcusably ignorant, condemn the Anarchist ideal as base and ignoble, however visionary and impracticable it may seem to be. However necessary government may seem to be, on account of the supposed viciousness of human nature, there are few who will not admit that if men were good enough and wise enough to do right spontaneously, formal laws would be unnecessary. It is urged, however, that Anarchists are not true to their exalted ideal, but are constantly guilty of the most wanton and inhuman depredations on the rights and lives of those who differ from them; that they hatch diabolical plots against the lives of all rulers; and that they are meditating a series of violent uprisings, which would fill the earth with blood, and plunge civilization back into the night of chaos.

The indictment is a terrible one. Were it true, the existence of our propaganda could not be justified. Were it true, we should have cause to dread the investigation we so readily court. Were it true, we should shun publicity, instead of seeking it. Were it true, the

newspapers would be able to bring forward abundant proof of our criminality, in support of their venomous and indiscriminating assaults on all who have seen fit to use the term Anarchism as defining their intellectual position; nor would they be so desperately afraid of allowing the Anarchist side to be fully heard, that it might be rated according to its merits. Were it true, evidence of the fact, especially at times like these, would multiply on every side; and nine-tenths of the Anarchists of the country would already be in prison, with the certainty of conviction for acts which need wait for no new laws to make them criminal—instead whereof, the law itself, having probed the matter to the bottom, has completely exonerated Emma Goldman, A. Isaak and every one of their associates from all guilt and from all suspicion of guilt. The vindication is the most complete and perfect possible, involving a reluctant testimony of innocence wrung from their bitterest enemies, and when the passion against them was inflamed to the highest degree.

The utter falsity of the charge, when applied to Anarchists as a class, would long since have become apparent, had sober reason been substituted for passionate invective. The whole wretched mistake arises from a childish play on words, which would be amusing, were not the results so serious. The popular use of the word anarchy, as a synonym for turmoil and confusion, is confounded with Anarchism as a speculative social philosophy, espoused and promulgated by many good and peaceful citizens. It is the same ridiculous logomachy by which some newspapers are trying to persuade the gullible that the suppression of DISCONTENT would quiet the discontent of millions of workingmen who have never heard of the paper. The methods of Anarchism do not savor of what is commonly called anarchy. We are evolutionists in the strictest sense. History teaches that social conditions do not remain stationary. The problem is to determine the normal direction of social change, and to cooperate with the evolutionary forces which are working to that end. The logical means to that end are peaceful and educational. Only shortsightedness, impatience and desperation suggest an appeal to force.

To be sure, there are great crises, and sometimes violent revolutions; but these are unavoidable reactions from oppressive conditions. They are generally epochs of madness, in which the voice of reason is silenced. They are not the fruit of any propaganda, but overwhelm all propaganda, for the time being. They are electric storms, which spring up spontaneously, and clear the atmosphere. They are rare, and arise only under very extreme conditions. They are not to be desired, except as the least of evils. Whether they come or not, the educational work remains the same. Develop intelligence; and

the result may be trusted to be for the best, in the long run.

The assassin may believe in Anarchy; but he adopts a method out of harmony with Anarchist principles and unsanctioned by the great body of Anarchist teachings. He is a phenomenon of social unrest, and not of Anarchist agitation. Wherever there is misery, he may be looked for, and nowhere else. The Anarchist propaganda does not produce him, nor endorse him. Government must be outgrown, rather than overthrown. Let the rulers and the terrorists fight it out among themselves. The Anarchist philosophy approves of neither, but points out the causes of both. Its great aim is to educate up to an ideal; and its methods are open and honorable. Individuals may fall short of their professions; but the fundamental tendency of Anarchism is to produce men and women of large individuality and fine character.

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

HOME.

Oh, Home, sweet Home! Home of beauty with its woodland paths and glistening waters of the bay. Home of peace and happiness, because there is love—love that is pure and true, the begetter of equality and justice. True, we have no churches with spires pointing skyward; neither have we saloons and drunkards, licensed houses of prostitution or prostitutes of either sex. Our love is pure, free to all. We are indeed Freelothers in the true meaning of the word. Freelothers are never prostitutes, any more than a real bona fide Anarchist is an assassin and murderer, or conceiver at murder.

The Anarchists at Home are noble souls, too kind and tender of heart to kill to eat, except on rare occasions, therefore it is seldom that even a chicken is slaughtered and its corpse devoured.

The man who shot the President may have called himself an Anarchist. If so, the name is a misnomer. An Anarchist will not take life, especially human life, except to defend his own, and some not even then. Like the Home people, Anarchists attend to their own affairs, instead of to other people's.

A resident of a place between Home and Tacoma, who was homeward bound from the latter place, asked one of the passengers on the boat where she lived. The man, unlike those from Home, had evidently imbibed too freely from the bottle.

"At Home," returned the lady. "You know where Home is?"

"Yes. I know. That's the place where they mind their own business, their own business, own business."

Surely people who "mind their own business," pay their taxes, are gentle and kind, wronging no one by word or deed, cannot be dangerous.

May they all live long, and continue to prosper as they so richly deserve, is the wish and prayer of

SADIE A. MAGOON.

THE LATEST PRESS OUTRAGE.

The defeat of the Comstock gang in the Moore case has not shaken their determination to unite in a determined effort to destroy free speech on social questions, and particularly on the sex question. For the second time they have invaded Home, this time to place in jeopardy the liberties of three members of our community. On Tuesday, September 24, a deputy marshal entered the office of DISCONTENT, bearing a warrant for the arrest of Charles L. Govan, James W. Adams, J. E. Larkin and G. Morong. The offence charged was that of "depositing lewd, lascivious and obscene matter in the mails," to wit, certain issues of DISCONTENT. Comrade Morong is not a member of the colony; but the other three were taken into custody. Our comrades were taken to Spokane, Wash., as provided for in the warrant. Bail was fixed at \$1,000 each. This being furnished our comrades were released, and are with us again. The trial will be held before Judge Hanford, of the federal court, in Tacoma, at its regular session, next February.

The articles complained of are understood to be that of James W. Adams, in No. 128, and especially certain quotations from "The Prodigal Daughter" contained therein; and that of G. Morong, in No. 149. Both of them are quietly argumentative in tone; and neither one contained a line calculated to inflame sensual passions. There is not a word in either which could offend the most susceptible ear. It is purely and solely a question of the right to express honest opinions on the sex question. The issue could not be more clearly drawn. Every American citizen should be interested in this test case. It is an open secret that a conviction in this case will mean other arrests, and a concerted attempt to destroy all discussion of vital social questions. The goodness or badness of the "free love" idea is not involved in the contest. It is simply a question of free speech. Those who believe in ignorance, and in the wanton invasion of individual liberty, will be found ranged on the side of the prosecution. Those who believe that knowledge is essential to progress, and that open discussion is the best roadway to knowledge, will support the defence.

This is no season for indifference. Popular prejudice is relied on to force a conviction. This must be met by a full presentation of the true facts, and of the real animus of the prosecution. The liberties of many others are bound up with the liberties of our persecuted comrades. This case must not be suffered to go by default. It calls for the united support of liberals everywhere, regardless of past divisions. Never mind your personal opinion of DISCONTENT or of its contributors. It is your fight, if you believe in free speech at all. The indicted comrades represent the principle of the liberty of the press.

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

DISCONTENT

DISCONTENT

"MOTHER OF PROGRESS".

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT HOME, WASH., BY
DISCONTENT PUBLISHING GROUP.

50 CENTS A YEAR

Address all communications and make
all money orders payable to DISCON-
TENT, Home, Pierce County, Wash.

OFF AND ON.

The supporters of imperialism are endeavoring to use the assassination of the president as an excuse for laying a stronger foundation whereon to build the empire of their dreams. This is a movement which should concern not only Anarchists, but all who entertain any manner of regard for the democratic ideals on which this nation is supposed to have been founded. It is a direct menace to all independence of thought, as well as to the security of any who desire even moderate changes in the administration of affairs. It means the speedy arrival of the armed man on horseback, and the rapid weeding out of the republican element in American institutions. Encroachments on human liberty are never made all at once. They creep in insidiously, and readily find some plausible pretext for their first steps. Sincere and honest citizens are seduced into supporting these initial measures by the plea of patriotic duty, and fail to realize the magnitude of their error until too late to remedy it. Shall the history of Athens and Rome be paralleled in the United States in the near future? Those who, in good faith, are advocating a new batch of "Alien and Sedition Laws," will do well to pause and consider the responsibility which they incur, and to ask themselves what the ultimate result is likely to be. In attempting to remedy one evil, they are thoughtlessly hastening to bring a worse evil upon the country. The charge of treason is a dangerous weapon to trifle with. Wielded today against Anarchists, and tomorrow against Socialists, it may next be used for the destruction of all who do not yield a cheerful assent to the conversion of a republic into an empire. Beware of the first false step.

One of the fundamental boasts of a democracy is that all men are equal before the law. The life of the humblest citizen is as sacred as that of the highest official. Whether this principle is observed in practice or not, it is essential to the theory of a democracy, and serves to distinguish that form of social organization from a monarchy or an empire. The footmarks of advancing imperialism are manifest in the proposition to make a distinction between the life of a president and that of any other person. No such distinction prevails in nature or in justice. It is a crime to murder a president. It is no whit less a crime to murder the humblest of the "common people." The criminality consists in the wanton invasion of the sanctity of human life, and not in the personality of the victim. When we, as a race, come to abhor all killing of our fellows, public or private, legal or illegal, wholesale or retail, we will have taken a long stride toward fitting ourselves for an ideal civilization. Speaking for myself,

I do not believe that the spirit of hate and revenge can ever bring in a free society.

Certain of the administration organs are pointing out, with a considerable show of indignation, that many attacks on the late president, in the Democratic papers of the country, equalled, if they did not exceed in ferocity any utterances attributed to the more radical press. It would be possible to go somewhat farther, without passing outside the domain of fact. The Democratic assaults were more dangerous, more calculated to arouse envenomed passions, more liable to inflame a weak mind, than any statements which appeared in the Anarchist or Socialist press. Not only is the enormous circulation of the Democratic organs to be taken into consideration, but the radical differences in their methods of attack. With them, the personal note was altogether predominant. McKinley as an individual was persistently and continually held up to ridicule, contempt and hatred. For four years, he has been the principal target for their most savage editorials and their most insulting cartoons. All that he has done or said has been systematically placed in the most unfavorable light. He has been pointed out as personally responsible for every policy of his party which was deemed in any way objectionable. The minds of millions of men have been kept constantly inflamed against this one man; and many who were not themselves readers of these papers were sensibly affected by the spirit of animosity engendered by them, and permeating the whole atmosphere.

The Anarchist and Socialist press, on the other hand, criticized McKinley as the representative of a system. He was simply an illustration of conditions that they condemned; and they did not single him out as conspicuously better or worse than the large majority of the class to which he belonged. He was typical of the prevailing sentiment, nothing more; and their sole effort was to appeal to fact and argument, in support of their contention that this sentiment was not founded on right reason. Nobody would ever glean from these papers any notion that the "removal" of the individual McKinley would make room for a better man, or lead to the introduction of a better system.

On the contrary, it was always made clear that the continuance or disappearance of a social system depends, not on the life or lives of an individual or of individuals, but on the action or consent of the great mass of the people. To change results, it is necessary to convince the people that the suggested change is desirable. This calls for no more violent weapons than those of agitation, discussion and education. The Democratic harangues, however, being mainly directed against the particular man, might well persuade a weak-minded person that the destruction of the obnoxious individual would speedily usher in a more satisfactory state of affairs. Therefore, if there is any *prima facie* evidence of guilt, it must rest with the Democratic party organs, and in no degree with the more radical press.

What then? Shall the American people be lured by the plea of public safety

to allow unabashed imperialism to complete its liberty-destroying work? Is the United States fit soil for a Russian press censorship, or for German *lese majeste* laws? Is the isolated crime of a crazed or desperate man to be deemed sufficient ground for silencing all who find themselves out of harmony with the sentiments of the party in power? If not, where is the line to be drawn? Is it not noteworthy that assassinations and attempts at violence are continual in every country where free speech is denied; and that the most constant, elaborate and expensive systems of police protection and surveillance cannot keep their rulers even approximately safe? Meanwhile, England and America, which have permitted almost unstinted criticism of their rulers, have reaped the highly satisfactory result of greatly enhanced public security. To depart from that policy would be to invite that desperate terrorism which prevails in all autocratic countries, and is invariably attendant on despotism. Terrorism always works secretly, in the dark, and is altogether apart from any public propaganda. Suppression of free speech only increases its resolution and ferocity, adds to the number of its adherents, and affords them ground for self-justification. The recency of the assassination of McKinley should blind no man's eyes to the fact that this act of a demented Pole stands alone in the history of the modern Anglo Saxon world. There is not even a pretext that any other assassination in England or America was ever committed by anybody having the slightest connection with Anarchism.

Frederick of Prussia, called the Great, was no end of a despot; but he knew a thing or two. One day, he came upon a knot of people, craning their necks to see a particularly vituperative placard against himself. "Put it down lower," said he to his aid de camp, "so that they can all read it. My people and I have an understanding that I do what I please, and they say what they please." Naturally enough, this ruler was not assassinated, although he lived in a wilder age than his degenerate successor, the present emperor of Germany, and did not take a tinge of the precautions found necessary by the latter. It pays to let public criticism have free course, even though much of it may appear grossly unjust.

The fear of public exposure is a powerful check on official corruption, and a tremendous leverage in the direction of a juster administration of affairs. Remove it; and public dishonesty would increase on every hand. Tamper with it in any way, under any pretext; and you establish a precedent of a kind under which tyranny and national dishonor flourish. An individual or an institution that cannot stand criticism is not worth much. The radical has exactly the same right to censure government or its representatives, that the conservative has to denounce radicals or conservatism.

At the same time, is the cause of truth and justice best advanced by a constant discharge of acrimonious personalities? Would it not be better for the advance guard of philosophic Anarchists to leave this business, as far as possible, to the less progressed "reform" element? It is more important to build up than to tear down. We have an im-

mense work cut out for us, in proving to the world, in the face of ignorance and calumny, that our foundation principles are worthy of respect and investigation. I have said extremely hard things of McKinley, and held myself justified, because I never wantonly departed from the exact truth as to the acts censured. Now I feel inclined to cry "Peccavi!" The presence of death makes all condemnation of the individual seem inconceivably trivial and useless. He is but a bubble on the troubled waters of social existence. No man can enter fully into the inner precincts of another's mind, and read clearly the motives that actuate him. Many a man is sincere, and justified in his own mind, in pursuing a line of conduct which appears to his equally conscientious neighbor little short of atrocious. All standards are relative, and constantly shifting, especially under progressive conditions. To condemn a man for what conditions have made him, is to put the cart before the horse. Let the individual rest, except where it becomes necessary to cite him as a strong illustration of the results of improper conditions. Our giant foe is human ignorance—our own first, and then that of the race. What we want, for ourselves and others, is more light, especially on fundamental principles. This can only be gained by a dispassionate survey of facts, and by sober reasoning, founded on them. It is not well to imitate the enemies of progress in becoming rabid and abusive extremists. Anarchism is a radical philosophy, since it deals with root-ideas; but it appeals to the judgment, and not to the inflamed passions.

The release of the Free Society group, after heaven and earth had been moved to secure evidence against them, drives another nail into the coffin of the already putrid theory of an Anarchist plot. All recent developments confirm the conclusion that Czolgosz was of unbalanced mind, and knew nothing of the real teachings of Anarchism. Had it not been for newspaper confusion of Anarchism with violence, he would never have thought of calling himself an Anarchist, or of seeking out Anarchists, in the hope of catching from their lips some word that his crazed brain might distort into justification for his already contemplated crime. If the newspapers had prepossessed him with the idea that the Democratic party was made up of cutthroats, he would have rushed off to hear one of Bryan's bitter diatribes against the administration, and would later have averred that it was the Nebraskan's oratory which set his brain on fire, and nerved his arm for its desperate act. Free speech is indeed but an idle mockery in this country, if the life or liberty of any public speaker or propagandist may at any moment be jeopardized, in consequence of the reckless asseverations of a homicidal maniac.

Free speech is annihilated in Tacoma, for the time being. A few over-zealous governmentalists, egged on by the daily press, holds the city at bay by the law of the bludgeon, and forbids the expression of any ideas with which it does not agree. Its latest exploit was to break up a peaceable Socialist meeting. It looks very much like a revival of the old Ku Klux days. When will men learn that the way to combat ideas is not by force, but by superior ideas?

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

DISCONTENT

PROPAGATION.

These many weeks, Comrade James has been raging at the unresponsive world for "kicking against the multiplication table." Perhaps it is time he and I had our fingers in each other's hair again; at least, I feel disposed to kick, on behalf of the world, after so many challenges. Let me therefore set down some points against the identification of Malthus with the multiplication table.

1. Many wild animals wholly or partly cease to produce young, when domesticated. The elephant is a noted instance.

2. Some breeds of the human race have this quality in a high degree; that is, their birth-rate falls almost to zero, when they live under civilized conditions. Darwin, in his "Descent of Man," names the Tasmanians as a leading instance.

3. Apparently all breeds of the human race have this quality in a greater or less degree; that is, their birth-rate falls lower and lower, as they become more and more civilized. I am told that Herbert Spencer has laid down this generalization as a law inductively proved. A familiar instance is that the birth-rate is lower among the upper classes than among the lower classes.

4. Apparently the above facts are not due to the "vices of civilization," nor to the avoidable unhealthiness of certain accompaniments of civilization (such as the constant wearing of clothes or the evils of in-door life), but to those qualities of civilized life which will and should increase with the progress of civilization. Clearly, too, these facts are not due to an intentional avoidance of children among the more civilized.

5. Therefore we may expect that, if civilization continues to advance, the birth-rate will automatically decrease. It may decrease so much that the growth of population will be slower than the growth of productivity, or even so that the growth of population will cease. To say positively that the automatic decrease will or will not reach any such given limit, is to carry assurance beyond the limit of experimental proof.

6. The birth-rate falls lower, as population grows more crowded. Apparently the influence of loneliness on the nervous system increases the reproductive tendency.

7. Consequently we may expect from the increase of population the same results as from the increase of civilization; and the union of the two causes adds to the probability that the automatic decrease of the birth-rate will suffice to prevent over-population.

All this is very fortunate. For it is in no way clear that Comrade James's panacea of greater liberty for woman will decrease the birth-rate. To take an extreme, but not extremely rare case, there are thousands of married couples where copulation regularly takes place every night from Christmas to Christmas. The ordinary result of this, I believe, is to sterilize the man. Obviously, in any such case, New Idealism would increase the number of births by making copulation infrequent enough not to interfere with reproductive power. Or, to take a wider view, medical men condemn the practice of man and wife habitually sleeping in one bed, because they say it leads to sexual ex-

cesses which injure the health. Now it is surely not likely that sexual excesses which injure the partner's health will be favorable to the increase of population. And the cases referred to will of course be mainly just such as Comrade James has in mind, when he charges marriage-slavery with causing over-population. Where the reproductive system in both man and wife is tough and vigorous, marital coercion may doubtless increase the number of births; where the reproductive system in either is delicate, or where the coercion is extreme in quantity, it will decrease the births. To say that the former tendency is the more extensive, is surely to speak without evidence.

It is *prima facie* a wild statement, too, to assert that "limiting sexual intercourse to the desires of the least amorous sex" will limit it enough to prevent over-population. The lack of quantitative connection between cause and effect is glaring. I do not know that Comrade James is chargeable with this assumption; but if not, he must admit that Malthusianism is just as threatening a problem for the sexually free as for the unfree.

I do not overlook his citation of Ireland as an instance of actual over-population; I only wonder if the man never read "Progress and Poverty." He might make a much more plausible case out of China, India or Pitcairn's Island; I have no objection to furnishing an opponent with facts. But I never heard that over-population was commonly supposed to have arisen in any country which had lately been enjoying a progressive civilization. *

STEVEN T. BYINGTON.

A WORD ON VEGETARIANISM.

I was greatly interested in an article in a recent number of *DISCONTENT* from the pen of Mr. J. A. Wilson, in which he strongly and forcibly set forth the arguments for a vegetarian diet, and urged it as a partial test of Anarchism. While I do not fully agree that vegetarianism is essential to the Anarchistic principle, I am greatly pleased to note that we have such an able advocate of the humane view in the ranks of freedom lovers. I venture the assertion that no flesh-eating Anarchist would concede the right of any man, or set of men, to take the life of an individual merely because he or they had the power and considered it proper to do so. To cite an instance, is there any advocate of Anarchism that would defend the taking of the lives of the Chicago Anarchists for an alleged infraction of the law? Not one will stand forth and defend this action of those in power; it was a legal murder, as unjust and unnecessary as it was brutal. A similar count can be brought against those who take, or advocate the taking of, sentient life, whether it be in the form of man or beast. It is unjust, because the creatures murdered have done nothing to merit destruction; it is unnecessary because scientific investigation and experience have proven that animal food is not essential to the perpetuation of human life; it is brutal because the cruel blow that severs the life chord comes from those whom the helpless creatures look upon as their friends and protectors—in this being more brutal than the treatment of the Chicago Anarchists.

In order to emphasize my position and argument I have only to refer to Mr. Morton's condemnation of Mr. Moore's expression: "I was not shown any more consideration than we showed a darkey at our Lexington meeting." Here was an implied injustice to a weaker representative of sentient existence, and Mr. Morton's high sense of justice revolted at such treatment. I might go a step further, and say that those representatives of the human race who band together and take the lives of negroes, for offences committed, or alleged to have been committed, show the said darkeys no more consideration than Anarchical advocates of vivisection and flesh eating show the sweet-faced cows in a slaughter house! Nay, not so much; for in the one case it is brutality in return for kindness, faithful service and harmlessness; while in the other it is brutality avenging gross animalism and brutality. The argument that you are not the butcher is unsound, as the eating of the butcher's product encourages the killing; and you thus become in effect a *particeps criminis*.

Where are you going to draw the line? Where is the "thus far but no farther" point? Where is the Anarchistic law (?) which grants the privilege of oppressing and destroying the animal which possesses no hands with which, nor inclination, to visit destruction upon others, while denying the right to even so much as abridge the liberty of the animal which walks upright, wears clothes and a sanctimonious smile? Understand I do not contend that abstinence from a flesh diet is to be a test of Anarchism; I simply cannot comprehend the incentive to kill which must be back of all meat eating—when such position is occupied by humane lovers of freedom.

If the line is drawn at intelligence many of the higher order of animals would escape destruction, while the slaughterhouse would be recruited, to some extent, from the human species; if you draw it at usefulness the same result would follow; if at weakness and inability to defend the life within some of each would change places; at only one point could the line of demarcation be drawn, it would seem, and there is where it now exists—the DESIRE to take life and pander to more or less depraved appetites; and the human species here holds a monopoly. Can the Anarchist afford to be classed among these?

If there is anything in which an advocate of absolute individual freedom should be supreme, it is the control of his bodily functions—his habits, appetites, passions, wrong tendencies of whatsoever nature. Nothing of a depraved or unnatural character should be permitted to dominate. Those things should be cultivated which make for peace, mental clearness, humanity, kindness and all that pertains to the higher nature; and certainly the taking of the lives of our fellow creatures, and a blood diet do not encourage the growth of those finer feelings which deprecate brutality, war, force and all that contributes to the present chaotic conditions.

I do not maintain that vegetarianism should be made a test of Anarchism—the very meaning of the term precludes the right of any individual to prescribe for any other individual—but I most earnestly plead for a broader interpreta-

tion of liberty by those professing to worship at her shrine—an interpretation that shall not limit the number of legs necessary to entitle animate creation to fellowship in a society whose platform is freedom and whose shibboleth is justice. I appeal to all readers of *DISCONTENT* to think deeply, for I know that they will then act wisely.

Olalla, Wash. L. E. RADER.

TO AGRICOLA.

My dear Comrade: I don't claim perfection in anything. That would be the position of C. L. James and a few others—with whom I can't agree. You claim that the abuses I complain of are not of and do not belong to Christianity, because you say Jesus never taught nor practised them; but that they are the abuses of the church. Very well; but you don't know that there ever was such an individual as Jesus Christ; and if you did, you couldn't follow his teachings in the New Testament, any more than you can follow the teachings of churhianity, and be honest and truthful.

You say he never taught revenge, but always forgiveness and mercy. What will you do with these sayings of the meek and lowly Nazarene? "Bring forth those mine enemies; and slay them before mine eyes." "Think you I came on earth to bring peace? I tell you nay, but a sword." "Go ye into all the earth, and preach the gospel. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." And then read in the sixteenth and last chapter of Mark what he avers believers can do; and see if you don't think believers would be scarce under the tests given. I contend that there isn't a believer on earth under those tests; and never was there one. And so there is no Christianity, and never was any; but it is all churhianity, and always was. I could give you a longer answer; but this I consider sufficient to show you courtesy—all I want to do, as I think arguments by interested parties ought to be kept out of reform papers, because they are not relevant to the cause; and, besides, they are calculated to engender bad feelings.

I will, however, notice one mistake of Comrade Morton's, which is calculated to mislead most people in the interest of regular doctors. He speaks of the science of medicine or of the practice of medicine. The practice of medicine can't be reduced to a science; and no one knows that any better than the regular humbugs themselves; because some constitutions would be able to stand twice or thrice the medicine that would kill others of less vitality. An old practitioner, who had become worn out in the profession, and knew whereof he spoke, said: "Every dose of medicine is an experiment." Comrade Morton ought to know that experiments are not science.

Surgery can be, and is reduced to a science; because every human anatomy is the same in all important features; not so with constitutions.

IMAGE BREAKER.

Trust men; and they will be true to you. Treat them greatly; and they will show themselves great, though they make an exception in your favor to all their rules of trade.—Emerson.

ANARCHY AND HUMANE FEELING.

How suavely Comrade Morton annihilates (in his own mind) every idea not his own. He is enthusiastic, plain-spoken, and generally right, but he is not infallible, so I must decline to accept his statement that humane sentiment is a question wholly foreign to Anarchism.

There certainly can be no chance for the compulsory vaccinationist to claim himself an Anarchist; for to vaccinate a man against his will is clearly a case of government of man by man.

As to vivisection and other forms of torture, the only question is whether solidarity embraces other sentient beings than man. I claim that it does; that Anarchism is a broader principle than mere opposition to organized government. If it is not, then it is only a secondary question. Universal kindness comes first of all. I question the sincerity of the "Anarchist" who loudly demands liberty for himself and has no consideration for harmless dumb animals; and I heartily detest any man, whether claiming to be an Anarchist or not, who utters one word in defence of vivisection, the most dastardly crime ever committed against our animal friends.

The man who would keep a live cat in a hot oven till she died, just to see how long she could endure the torture, (an act vivisectionists are guilty of,) is no more fit to associate with decent men than is the titled tyrant of any eastern monarchy. No government of man by man is more outrageous than the cutting to pieces of living animals without the use of anaesthetics, whether in the interests of "science" or for sport. Any school of Anarchism which does not repudiate such cruelties is not advanced enough for me; and I venture the prediction that Church and State will continue to exploit as long as children are brought up to have no regard for the rights and feelings of their animal cousins.

J. A. WILSON.

Comment.

Comrade Wilson knows that I never said or implied that "humane sentiment is a question wholly foreign to Anarchism." I simply criticized his attempt to read out of the movement all whose definition of "humane sentiment" does not precisely agree with his own. All things must come in their order. The kinship between man and man is closer and more obvious than that between man and the other animals. If men will not learn to be just and kind to each other, they will not deal justly and kindly with "their animal cousins."

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

TO THE COMRADES:

Since the assassination of McKinley an organization known as the Loyal League has been formed in this county, having for its object "the annihilation of Anarchists and Anarchism." Now, I feel very desirous of aiding these good people in unearthing everything of an anti-governmental character. Therefore I will ask the comrades to send in quotations from so-called classical writers that are decidedly anarchistic in tendency.

In all cases, please give the title of the work quoted, with edition, chapter and page (when possible), so that the quota-

tion may be easily verified. When quotations are long, give references merely.

I will do my best to bring these quotations to the notice of our friends of the "Loyal League," as I think it will materially aid them, not only in forming a just conception of the diabolical intent of anti-governmentalism, but also in having legislation so directed as to "annihilate" all anarchistic teachings or tendencies. Fraternally,

Home, Wash. J. E. LARKIN.

HOME NEWS

E. C. Miles has gone to California for the winter.

Jacob Kulis, of Chicago, is here for a short visit, looking over the ground.

Oscar Carlson, of Anderson Island, spent several days with us this week.

All our hoppickers have returned, after a pleasant and profitable outing.

Jens Ludholm, of Everett, has come to spend the winter with us, much to the gratification of his many friends in the colony.

Personal investigation is the best antidote to newspaper lies. Citizens of Tacoma are invited to come out here any day, and see us exactly as we are. We have nothing to conceal, and promise not to put on any extra frills, in order to beguile the unwary.

Last week, we received a visit from Rev. J. F. Deuscher, pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Tacoma. Alone among the clergy of that city, he declined to condemn even Anarchists, without proper investigation. In a lecture in the schoolhouse, on Thursday evening, he gave us a frank exposition of his own belief in orthodox Christianity, which make us respect the man, although we could not accept his creed.

The land owned by the Mutual Home Association is located on Von Geldern Cove (known locally as Joes Bay), an arm of Carrs Inlet, and is 13 miles west from Tacoma on an air line, but the steamer route is about 20 miles.

The association is simply a land-holding institution, and can take no part in the starting of an industry. All industries are inaugurated by the members interested and those willing to help them. Streets are not opened yet and we have no sidewalks. Those thinking of coming here must expect to work, as it is not an easy task to clear this land and get it in condition for cultivation. There are 87 people here—24 men, 23 women and 40 children—girls over 15 years 4, boys 3. We are not living communistic, but there is not anything in our articles of incorporation and agreement to prohibit any number of persons from living in that manner if they desire to do so. Those writing for information will please inclose a self-addressed, stamped envelope for reply.

RECEIPTS.

Burr \$2, Soule \$1, Gleeser \$1, Carlson \$1, Fretz \$1, Hicklin \$1, Mullen 25c, Barnes 25c, Clarke 25c.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS FOR SALE BY DISCONTENT

Perfect Motherhood. Lois Waisbrooker. 100

Irene or the Road to Freedom. Sada Bailey Fowler. 100

Business Without Money. W. H. Van Ornum. 50

Helen Harlow's Vow. Lois Waisbrooker. 25

God and the State. By Michael Bakunin. 05

Moribund Society and Anarchy. By Jean Grave. 25

Anarchy. By Enrico Malatesta. Is It All a Dream? By Jas. F. Morton, Jr. 10

God and Government: The Siamese Twins of Superstition. W. E. Nevill. 05

The Chicago Martyrs; The Famous Speeches of the Eight Anarchists in Judge Gary's Court, and Altgeld's Reasons for Pardoning Fielden, Neebe and Schwab. 25

Five Propaganda Leaflets on the Sex Question. 10

Personal Rights and Sexual Wrongs. What the Young Need to Know. E. C. Walker. 10

The Revival of Puritanism. E. C. Walker. 10

Appeal to the Young. Kropotkin. Mating or Marrying, Which? W. H. Van Ornum. 05

The Evolution of the Family. Jonathan Mayo Crane. 05

Love in Freedom. Moses Harman. 05

The Evolution of Modesty. Jonathan Mayo Crane. 05

The Regeneration of Society. Lillian Harman. 05

Motherhood in Freedom. Moses Harman. 05

Institutional Marriage. M Harman. 05

A Tale of the Strassburg Geese. 05

The Coming Woman. Lillie D. White. 05

Plain Words on the Woman Question. Grant Allen. With remarks by E. C. Walker. 05

Variety vs. Monogamy. E. C. Walker. 05

Marriage and Morality. Lillian Harman. 05



Contains a full, plain, and easy reading treatise on "Health and Disease, with Recipes," all the average reader can profitably learn of personal hygiene and common diseases (including special, separate chapters for men and women); all right up-to-date, and fully illustrated with hundreds of photo-engravings and chromo-lithographs. Contains also the already popular "Plain Home Talk" about the relations of the sexes and social customs in all ages and all countries, with "original and startling" suggestions for social reforms; newly revised, enlarged, and well illustrated. All is "heart to heart" plain home talk from a clear thinking, plain speaking, liberal minded medical author of over forty years' experience. Nearly 1,000,000 of his former books sold. A curious book for curious people, and a sensible book for everyone. Answers 100 delicate questions one would like to ask his regular physician and yet doesn't want to. 1248 pages, 400 illustrations (60 in colors), 250 recipes. Price, clothbound, \$2, mailed. 240 SAMPLE PAGES, including two full chapters, in handsome "Flashlight" cover, mailed for 6 cents postage.

Tocology for Mothers
330 pages, illustrated, cloth bound; by mail \$1. American reprint of "The Wife and Mother Medical Guide," an up-to-date English work, with added illustrations in the text, and twelve artistic and appropriate full page half-tone engravings. The latest and best book for popular instruction on child-bearing and child-caring. Edited for this country by Dr. E. B. Foote, Jr. MURRAY HILL PUB. CO., 129 E. 28th St., New York

Articles of Incorporation and Agreement of the Mutual Home Association.

Be it remembered, that on this 17th day of January, 1898, we, the undersigned, have associated ourselves together for the purpose of forming a corporation under the laws of the State of Washington.

That the name of the corporation shall be The Mutual Home Association.

The purpose of the association is to assist its members in obtaining and building homes for themselves and to aid in establishing better social and moral conditions.

The location of this corporation shall be at Home, located on Joes Bay, Pierce County, State of Washington; and this association may establish in other places in this state branches of the same where two or more persons may wish to locate.

Any person may become a member of this association by paying into the treasury a sum equal to the cost of the land he or she may select, and one dollar for a certificate, and subscribing to this agreement.

The affairs of this association shall be conducted by a board of trustees, elected as may be provided for by the by-laws.

A certificate of membership shall entitle the legal holder to the use and occupancy of not less than one acre of land nor more than two (less all public streets) upon payment annually into the treasury of the association a sum equal to the taxes assessed against the tract of land he or she may hold.

All money received from memberships shall be used only for the purpose of purchasing land. The real estate of this association shall never be sold, mortgaged or disposed of. A unanimous vote of all members of this association shall be required to change these articles of incorporation.

No officer, or other person, shall ever be empowered to contract any debt in the name of this association.

All certificates of membership shall be for life.

Upon the death of any member a certificate of membership shall be issued covering the land described in certificate of membership of deceased:

First: To person named in will or bequest.

Second: Wife or husband.

Third: Children of deceased; if there is more than one child they must decide for themselves.

All improvements upon land covered by certificate of membership shall be personal property, and the association as such has no claim thereto.

Any member has the right of choice of any land not already chosen or set aside for a special purpose.

CERTIFICATE OF MEMBERSHIP.
This is to certify that _____ has subscribed to the articles of incorporation and agreement and paid into the treasury of the Mutual Home Association the sum of _____ dollars, which entitles _____ to the use and occupancy for life of lot _____ block _____, as platted by the association, upon complying with the articles of agreement.

SEND 10 CENTS for specimens of 10 liberal papers and 10 tracts, circulars and sample of stocking yarn, or 3 cents for a copy of "Little Freethinker." Elmina Drake Slenker, Snowville, Va.

THE NEW HEDONISM.

BY GRANT ALLEN.

Grant Allen needs no introduction to reading, thinking men and women. Man of science, a writer of charming expository and imaginative prose, he was, perhaps, at his best when bravely leading on, as in this brilliant brochure, in the fight against degrading religious and moral superstitions and time-sacred wrongs. No brief description can tell you what this splendid little work embraces no short excerpts can satisfy you. Price 5 cents.

FOR SALE BY DISCONTENT.

MEETING.

The Independent Debating Club meets every Sunday at 2 p.m. at 919 Market street, San Francisco, Calif. Free discussion. Public invited.